

## Weekly Intelligencer.

OFFICIAL COUNTY PAPER.

Arbor day, April 15.

Hurrah for Jno. S. Marmaduke!

The legislature adjourned last Monday.

The last one was a Dem; the next one will be an Ill.

Carter Harrison has been nominated for mayor again in Chicago.

The new Richmond house at Buffalo burned, March 18, with great loss of life.

President Cleveland's family and friends deny that there is any trouble about his health.

It appears at Jefferson City that the general deficiency bill was never enrolled, so it fails.

The Marshall Democrat ably and zealously supports Gov. Marmaduke's proclamation to the legislature.

Independence Sentinel:—No such president as Cleveland has occupied the White House since Jackson left it.

The St. Louis Republican has been doing noble service for Missouri in its able and fearless war for railroad legislation.

Who want a sound, reasonable bill will now be enabled to see the bill.

The democratic press of the state is almost unanimous in its support of the governor's calling an extra session to consider railroad legislation.

The deficiency appropriation alone would justify the calling of an extra session, not to say the railroad legislation.

The superintendent of Schools W. H. H. recommends Friday, April 1, for day for all the schools in the state.

We shall print his circular next week.

Intelligence from Senator J. S. Marmaduke, that he is getting better, and will recover his speech in a day or two. We hope so. It would be a misfortune to the state if he were prevented from attending the extra session.

No sane or reasonable man desires to injure the railroads. But it is one thing to do this, and quite another to let the railroads be the agents of the state.

The president has appointed the interstate commerce commission as follows:—Thomas M. Cochrane, of Michigan; Wm. R. Morrison, of Ohio; Augustus Schoenmaker, of New York; and Walter L. Walker, of Alabama.

What objections have the railroads to the senate or house bills at Jefferson? If any, why do they not form them? These are insidious enemies. They are intelligent, vigilant, wealthy and well equipped. Whilst the people are in their shops, stores, warehouses, and their farms or in their mines, they are in attendance upon canons of whatever party, at boards of assessors, in chimney-corner practices with the judges of the land, and in all of its legislative bodies. They never tire; they never sleep; for there are ample rewards for all purposes. And the people? They have the power to remedy all this if they will, but as a rule they like it out in grumbling. They suffer from extortion, impositions, discriminations. They complain and they demand. They fear the delays and expenses of the law, and they do not speak out to their public servants in a way that cannot be misunderstood. The time for all that is past, unless the fight for justice and equity is to be given up, and the law is to be left to the courts. Gov. Marmaduke, all honor to him for his substantially declared that with his consent the people of Missouri shall not be governed by a mob lobby at Jefferson City. He has announced his determination to call the general assembly together again at an early day, and the law is to be put in force. Gov. Marmaduke, all honor to him for his substantially declared that with his consent the people of Missouri shall not be governed by a mob lobby at Jefferson City. He has announced his determination to call the general assembly together again at an early day, and the law is to be put in force.

The state constitution, article IV, section 5, says:—"The general assembly shall have no power, when convened to extra session by the governor, to set upon subjects other than those specially designated in the proclamation by which the session is called, or to be called by special message to the session by the governor after it has been convened." This will prevent any log-rolling in the extra session, and bring the members equally to the consideration of the business mentioned in the call.

During the session of the legislature, when it might have influenced republican legislators to vote for railroad legislation, our local contemporary had very little if anything to say upon the subject. It was occupied, we believe, in discussing woman suffrage in Wyoming, but this week it denounces the verity of the republican minority in voting solidly against the railroad bills, or late than never, of course, but had not been for the call of the governor for an extra session.

## RAILROAD LEGISLATION.

The legislature adjourned last Monday, without adopting the railroad legislation recommended by the platform of both of the political parties; secured such legislation as will carry out the provisions of the constitution in regard to the regulation of railroads.

For this lamentable result there were various causes:

(1) The usual jealousy between gentlemen who introduced bills and who hoped to have their names attached to whatever legislation might be secured.

(2) The ever-recurring quarrel over the constitutional question, urged primarily by men unacquainted with the history of legislation upon the subject, and by those who desire a loophole through which to escape from the wrath of their constituents.

(3) The baleful influence of a brazen and shameless lobby, thoroughly informed as to men and the mode of passing laws, using flattery in one case, a present threat, and cold and unadorned bodice wherever it can be placed. Fortunately for American unadorned we believe it may be said that the resort to the latter is the exception and not the rule. But there are so many other ways. Beside those we have hinted at there are the parliamentary tricks and dickers and truffles. It is wonderful how far a few votes, well secured, may be made to go by trades with every fellow who has a pet measure and needs them. In this log-rolling, much of it is the sacred names of education and charity, is to be found the root of the extravagance of our legislative bodies.

(4) And last, but not least, the unparliamentary conduct of the republican minority, which is directly responsible for the failure of legislation, in its conspiracy to prevent the passage of any law presented by the committee of the democratic house or senate. If the republicans had carried out their pledges to the people, and voted according to their individual views, instead of at the behest of their party caucus, the desired law would have been secured. This is illustrated by the fact, that their leader as railroad measures, Senator Archer, the bill known as Senate bill number 45, upon which, and upon Senator Harmon's bill, number 293 in the senate, and number 620 in the house. And yet, either in response to the party whip, or from a worse motive, this dignified senator, and leader of his party, with an excuse upon his lips too meretricious and trivial to deceive a school boy, turned his back upon his own record, and ate his own words. Truly, was there ever such an exhibition of partisan duplicity to the public interests?

How long would it be with such influences as these unrestrained before Missouri would be as helpless in the hands of corporations as is Pennsylvania? These are insidious enemies. They are intelligent, vigilant, wealthy and well equipped. Whilst the people are in their shops, stores, warehouses, and their farms or in their mines, they are in attendance upon canons of whatever party, at boards of assessors, in chimney-corner practices with the judges of the land, and in all of its legislative bodies. They never tire; they never sleep; for there are ample rewards for all purposes. And the people? They have the power to remedy all this if they will, but as a rule they like it out in grumbling. They suffer from extortion, impositions, discriminations. They complain and they demand. They fear the delays and expenses of the law, and they do not speak out to their public servants in a way that cannot be misunderstood. The time for all that is past, unless the fight for justice and equity is to be given up, and the law is to be left to the courts. Gov. Marmaduke, all honor to him for his substantially declared that with his consent the people of Missouri shall not be governed by a mob lobby at Jefferson City. He has announced his determination to call the general assembly together again at an early day, and the law is to be put in force.

The state constitution, article IV, section 5, says:—"The general assembly shall have no power, when convened to extra session by the governor, to set upon subjects other than those specially designated in the proclamation by which the session is called, or to be called by special message to the session by the governor after it has been convened." This will prevent any log-rolling in the extra session, and bring the members equally to the consideration of the business mentioned in the call.

During the session of the legislature, when it might have influenced republican legislators to vote for railroad legislation, our local contemporary had very little if anything to say upon the subject. It was occupied, we believe, in discussing woman suffrage in Wyoming, but this week it denounces the verity of the republican minority in voting solidly against the railroad bills, or late than never, of course, but had not been for the call of the governor for an extra session.

## THE EXTRA SESSION OF THE LEGISLATURE.

Gov. Marmaduke has wisely determined to call the legislature together again at an early day, in order to secure such legislation as will carry out the provisions of the constitution in regard to the regulation of railroads.

In doing so he will have the unqualified endorsement of the great body of the people. A few interested persons, or persons under the influence of the railroads, will, no doubt, very strenuously object, but the mass of the people will say, "Well done, good and faithful servant." It is a grand thing to have a governor who is not only honest, but who possesses the rare qualification of having the courage of his convictions.

It will be said that the extra session will cost \$100,000, \$200,000—anything, indeed, to render it unpopular in advance. If this were true the state would better afford to spend five times these sums than permit itself to be governed by a shameless lobby at Jefferson City. This is a mere bagatelle as compared with the benefits to be derived from a good railroad law. The sum will thereby be saved to the people weekly.

It is the duty of republicans as well as democrats to aid in this cause, but few democrats particularly to democrats. It is our duty to stand by the governor, and not to foster divided policies in the party; we owe it to the party, honestly to support the honest declarations of its platform; and, finally, what is of position would we be in to go before the people in a general election with our pledges upon this subject unimpaired?

All honor to Gov. Marmaduke for his courage in knowing the right, and when knowing daring to maintain it. Now, let the legislature discard all jealousies, repulse all extraneous influences, and go honestly to work to pass the legislation which was with so much ability and labor prepared for the people, and believed in by the senate and house committees.

Meeting of the Board of Directors of the Lexington Building and Loan Association.

LEXINGTON, Mo., March 23, 1887.

The Board of Directors of the Lexington Building and Loan Association met pursuant to a call by the president, Wm. G. McCausland, president, in the chair.

Minutes of the previous meeting read and approved.

The board of J. S. Westworth, the treasurer, and J. S. Westworth and Richard Field as sureties, and the bond of S. S. Reed, with Dr. P. S. Fulkerson and George M. Mounsey as sureties, were received and approved.

H. Sinauer, secretary pro tem, submitted his report, which was referred to the finance committee.

The president appointed the following standing committees:

Real Estate Committee—Jas. Taubman, C. W. Loomis and R. E. Smith.

Building Committee—A. A. Lessor, J. R. Moorehead and W. F. K. Smith.

Finance Committee—H. Sinauer, G. S. Sturges and Wm. J. Morrison.

On motion of Jas. Taubman, the appointment of H. Sinauer, the president was appointed the custodian of secretary and treasurer's bonds.

The following committee was appointed: W. F. K. Smith, J. R. Moorehead, C. W. Loomis and L. Shields.

The following committee was appointed to procure rooms for the meetings of the board and association: Bandson, Smith and Morrison.

The president was instructed to instruct the secretary to procure rooms for the meetings of the board and association: Bandson, Smith and Morrison.

The secretary pro tem was instructed to turn over all papers and money in his hands belonging to the association to the secretary, as soon as his report is examined and approved by the finance committee.

The meeting then adjourned subject to call by the president, H. Sinauer, secretary.

Grand English Opera.

Miss Kate Benson, prima donna soprano of Carl Rosa's grand English Opera Company, supported by Miss Pauline Monte, contralto, formerly with the Adeline Patti, and other artists, will appear at the opera house on Saturday night, April 9, if patient encouragement is given by the sale of tickets now offered at Ludwigs' store.

County Board of Equalization.

The County Board of Equalization met on Monday, April 4, 1887, and resumed its session from the adjournment of the previous day. All parties who had been notified by the assessment as made by the county assessor will have an opportunity to have same adjusted and equalized, and if there is any mistake in assessments the same may be corrected.

By order of the Board.

Attest: W. B. STEELE, Secretary.

Stock Notes.

Mr. R. W. Keene advertises his splendid stallion, Buford, in another column.

Mr. J. D. Robinson has the fine trotting stallion, Howard Duke at his place this week. Breeder will do well to see him.

On account of

## C. O. GATSON NOT SO BADLY MIS-TAKEN AS STATED.

Editor INTELLIGENCER:—Press of business delayed my reply to Judges Hale and Elling, I hope you and the patrons of your paper will bear with me in this intrusion upon your time. In the commencement of this article permit me to say, by way of explanation, that when I said that the old court was a little low in its enforcement of the law, I did not mean to convey the idea that the members of the old court were not honest, but, on the contrary, I believe them both to be possessed of sterling worth and integrity, but a little misguided in judgment. It is a fact well-known by the good people of Lexington and numbers of the county officials, that the judges have had more than one rule by which they professed to be governed in the discharge of their duties. Again, a member of the legal fraternity told me before this controversy began that he had urged and insisted upon the court adopting rules in harmony with the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges, in consequence of the law for them, but could never get them to do it.

I was credibly informed (and am still so) that such was the case that some 18 months ago the court adopted a rule requiring that each case be argued by a rule of law, and that the judges should be governed by the law, but that the judges,